Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 USUN N 04601 091722Z

66
ACTION IO-14

INFO OCT-01 AF-10 ARA-16 EA-11 EUR-25 NEA-10 RSC-01

CIAE-00 DODE-00 PM-07 H-03 INR-10 L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-10

PA-04 PRS-01 SPC-03 SS-20 USIA-15 ACDA-19 ISO-00

OMB-01 DRC-01 /185 W
---------- 081044
R 081632Z NOV 73
FM USMISSION USUN NY
TO SECSTATE WASHDC 941
INFO AMEMBASSY LONDON
AMEMBASSY MOSCOW
AMEMBASSY TOKYO
AMEMBASSY OTTAWA
AMEMBASSY BRASILIA

C O N F I D E N T I A L USUN 4601

E.O. 11652: GDS
TAGS: PFOR, UN
SUBJ: NEXT STEPS ON PEACEKEEPING

REF: STATE 219196 (NOTAL)

1. AS REQUESTED REFTEL, WE CONSULTED NOVEMBER 8 WITH REPRESENTATIVES FROM UK, CANADA, JAPAN AND BRAZIL ON NEXT PEACEKEEPING STEPS. MEETING'S IMMEDIATE PURPOSE WAS TO DEVELOP COMMON POSITION ON DISPUTED PROCEDURAL QUESTION OF WHAT THE PEACEKEEPING COMMITTEE WORKING GROUP SHOULD TAKE UP NEXT. (WORKING GROUP SCHEDULED MEET NOV 13 TO IRON OUT THIS QUESTION AND ADOPT ITS REPORT.) PROBLEM OF HOW TO PROCEED SUBSTANTIVELY WAS ALSO DISCUSSED, AND CLEAR CONSENSUS AMONG OTHER PARTICIPANTS WAS THAT NOW WAS NOT BEST TIME TO ATTEMPT TO RESOLVE OUTSTANDING PEACEKEEPING PROBLEMS. MAIN REASON WAS THAT UNEF EXERCISE WAS TOO CLOSE, AND TIME WAS NEEDED TO SORT OUT ITS LESSONS.
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 USUN N 04601 091722Z

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

2. AFTER SKETCHING HISTORY OF WG DISPUTE OVER WHETHER RESPONSIBILITIES OF SYG OR ARTICLE 29 COMMITTEE BE CONSIDERED NEXT, AMB. SCHAUFELE SAID US HAD DECIDED IT COULD AGREE, RELUCTANTLY, TO TAKING UP ARTICLE 29 COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITIES AS FIRST ITEM WHEN WG RECONVENED. HE ASKED OTHERS' VIEWS. BRITISH SAID THEY WOULD MUCH PREFER VAGUER LANGUAGE. IN FIRST PLACE, SOVIETS AHD NO BASIS FOR CONTENDING THAT WG HAD AGREED TO GIVE PRIORITY CONSIDERATION TO ARTICLE 29 COMMITTEE AND, SECONDLY, UK THOUGHT OF COMMITTEE AS "POSSIBLE CONSULTATIVE BODY," FOR WHICH IT WOULD BE HARD TO DEFINE CLEAR-CUT RESPONSIBILITIES. UK NEVERTHELESS HAD NO WISH TO HOLD UP WG REPORT OVER ISSUE. JAPANESE, CANADIANS AND BRAZILIANS SAID THEY TOO COULD GO ALONG.

3. BRAZILIAN REP SAID HIS GOVT WAS INCREASINGLY PERSUADED THAT COMMITTEE OF 33 APPROACH HAD LOST TOUCH WITH REALITY. ESTABLISHMENT OF UNEF HAD SHOWN AD HOC NATURE OF PEACEKEEPING DECISION-MAKING, AND HAD THROWN INTO QUESTION UTILITY OF DETAILED GUIDELINES. BRAZIL WOULD LIKE TO KEEP DOOR OPEN FOR DIFFERENT APPROACH LOOKING TOWARD LOOSER GUIDELINES AND MORE GENERAL FRAMEWORK FOR ACTION.

4. UK SAID IT PLANNED TO REFER IN SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE TO PROPOSAL IT HAD SUBMITTED TO WG, BUT ONLY IN GENERAL TERMS. IT CERTAINLY HAD NO INTENTION OF TABLING FORMAL PROPOSAL BEFORE END OF GA. UK FELT - AND OTHERS AGREED - THAT THERE WAS INSUFFICIENT TIME TO HANDLE A MAJOR INITIATIVE IN SPC.

5. PROBLEM WAS DISCUSSED OF HOW TO RECONCILE LANGUAGE OF PARA 5 OF WG REPORT, "DECIDING" TO TAKE UP ARTICLE 29 COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITIES NEXT, WITH OBJECTIVE OF KEEPING DOOR OPEN TO SOME OTHER APPROACH AFTER GA. TWO POSSIBILITIES WERE CONSIDERED: FIRST, TO SUBSTITUTE "RECOMMENDED" FOR "DECIDED," SECOND, TO APPEND TO PARA 5 QUALIFYING LANGUAGE SUCH AS "SUBJECT TO CONCURRENCE OF THE COMITE OF 33 AND GENERAL ASSEMBLY." IN LATTER CASE, OBJECTIVE WOULD BE TO HAVE ASSEMBLY RECOMMEND TO SPC THAT IT REVIEW PROCEDURES OF COMMITTEE OF 33.

6. PARTICIPANTS AGREED TO CONVEY INDIVIDUALLY TO CHAIRMAN
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 USUN N 04601 091722Z

OF PEACEKEEPING COMMITTEE THEIR VIEWS ON HOW TO HANDLE WG PROCEDURAL IMPASSE. WE HAVE IMPRESSION MOST WILL ALSO TELL CHAIRMAN THAT THEIR PREFERENCE IS TO AVOID GOING DEEPLY INTO SUBSTANCE UNTIL AFTER ASSEMBLY.
SCALI

CONFIDENTIAL

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

NNN

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: INTERNATIONAL PEACEKEEPING FORCES, PEACE PLANS, COMMITTEE MEETINGS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 08 NOV 1973
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: garlanwa
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1973USUNN04601
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Film Number: n/a
From: USUN NEW YORK
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1973/newtext/t19731145/aaaabhfc.tel
Line Count: 112
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: ACTION IO
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: STATE 219196 (NOTAL)
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: garlanwa
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 09 OCT 2001
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <09-Oct-2001 by shawdg>; APPROVED <11-Dec-2001 by garlanwa>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: NEXT STEPS ON PEACEKEEPING
TAGS: PFOR, XF, UN, UNEF
To: STATE
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005